

Dowling, the acting Surveyor-General, had constructed on Stonecutters' Island a temporary lazarette, which was found invaluable in the treatment of cases. A few weeks after Mr. J. M. Price returned from his lengthy leave of absence on urgent private affairs, he had this lazarette taken down and the materials conveyed to the new Tytam waterworks, without making any provision for a possible return of the plague. We all know what happened when cholera again visited us this summer. There was no place to put the patients in, as the lazarette had been removed to the Tytam waterworks by order of the Surveyor-General, according to report, to save the wages paid to the watchman for looking after it. There could be no doubt that numbers of lives were lost owing to there being no lazarette, and certainly a grave responsibility rests on the Surveyor-General for taking away this suitable building, without providing anything in its place. Medical men of standing in the colony, even high officers of the government service, had spoken to him on the matter, and as whatever he had written on the subject was with the end of securing the protection of the colony from the dreaded effects of a visitation of cholera, he was justified in so doing, and was proud of having done so. If Mr. Price had considered himself injured by these articles, he (the defendant) would have justified them in that court if necessary. Defendant regretted that Mr. Francis had seen fit to put in the stupid letter signed "Hudibras." He had been put to quite enough trouble already about the paltry matter, which certainly did not make any offensive reference to the prosecutor in this case. He had been judged guilty of contempt of court and bound over, also cast in heavy expenses, and thought that was quite enough. He would again state that he had no animus whatever against Mr. Price, and when the matter was brought up at the Police Court he publicly and openly declared that no imputations or accusations were intended against that gentleman. As the alleged libel had only been published in the *Telegraph*, and the statement at the Police Court in the whole of the papers in the colony, he could not think the character of the Surveyor-General could have suffered any injury. However, he deemed it but fair to Mr. Price to publicly state that no imputations were intended to be cast upon him by the article, and he repeated it now. The liberty of the press was at stake. It lay with the jury to decide whether the press of this colony was to be muzzled by the Government or by anybody else, and he contended the press was at perfect liberty to comment honestly on all matters of public interest without being laid open to prosecutions of this character. He thought the jury would see that it was to the public advantage that the press should be protected in the performance of the duties it owed to the public. In the exercise of this duty, he was aware it had been necessary for him to frequently offend men whom he privately esteemed, but he had sacrificed his personal feelings to what, rightly or wrongly, he considered his public duty. In a small place like Hongkong, where there were so many abuses, and where everyone was more or less known to each other, a newspaper could not possibly be conducted in an independent manner without giving offence to many people. Defendant then dwelt briefly on the meaning of the term libel, and quoted from well-known writers, such as Macaulay, Sydney Smith, May &c., defining the general principle of the law. He said that the officials of the Hongkong Government were apparently a thin-skinned race, he stated that the term "job" was very commonly applied to petty political intrigues at home, and such a thing as taking legal proceedings was unheard of. In proof of this, defendant read extracts from an article in the *World*, under the heading, "Next to Godliness," in which Mr. Gladstone was charged with having perpetrated "an abominable job" in appointing his private secretary, Mr. Godley, to the office of Permanent Under-Secretary of State for India. If it was not considered derogatory to the reputation of the Prime Minister of Great Britain to be openly accused of being the author of "an abominable job," the alleged inference of jobbery in the paragraph in the *Telegraph* could surely have little effect on the character of a Surveyor-General of a third rate colony. Defendant then explained what caused the alleged libel to be written. One of the staff of the Surveyor-General's department called at his office, and in course of conversation between defendant, his brother and this person, the Tytam waterworks were alluded to. Defendant laughingly observed to this person that he supposed he would make a good thing out of the waterworks, and the official replied that he was not so badly off, but that they were looked after shabby by the Surveyor-General, who liked all the good things to his own cheek. Defendant considered that there was justification in publishing this, as it was a public matter which ought to be investigated. He also read an extract from an article in the *Hongkong Telegraph* of the 26th May, 1883, dealing with the question of a number of contractors who had completed their work, but could not get paid because they would not submit to give "squeezes" to certain officials. After the article appeared in the *Telegraph*, the affairs were taken up by Mr. Marsh, the Administrator, and the media were paid after waiting some six or seven months, without further delay. A copy of the *China Mail* was put in, after defendant had read a paragraph in which a rumour was given, publicly, that government contracts were carried out at a cost of fifty per cent, over the prices paid by private individuals for similar works. Defendant had a number of copies of the *Telegraph*, containing articles in which Mr. Price's abilities and character were highly spoken of, but it was hardly worth while to trouble the jury with them. He would now deal with the legal bearings of the case. The Court was at this stage adjourned for fifteen, and on resuming, the defendant addressed his Lordship on the legal points as follows:—

In the absence of proof of actual malice is privileged. In the *Pail Mail Gazette* case, *Hunter v. Sharp* (4 Forster and Fylyson 983) decided in 1866, Sir Alexander Cockburn uttered his ruling in the case of *Campbell v. Spottiswoode*, and also in *Wason v. Walter* (Lush. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23) in 1868; and these decisions were again confirmed in 1872 in *Henwood v. Harrison* (L. R. 7 C. P. 606). In the last named case the present state of the law is summed up at page 625 as follows:—"Fair and honest discussion of, or comments upon a matter of public interest is in point of law privileged, and it is not the subject of an action unless the plaintiff can establish malice." If the legal defence of privilege may be defined as commonly accepted, and as was laid down by Baron Parke in the well known case *Toogood v. Spry*, (11 C. M. & R. 181) to the effect that a privilege exists in one case, it is the legal defence of malice, it is for the prosecutor to prove actual malice against the defendant, and if he fails to do this, I submit that this prosecution cannot be maintained, and that there is either no case for a jury, or it is your Lordship's duty to direct the jury to return a verdict of "not guilty." The question of privilege is the essence of this case, and that simply means, as I have already stated, that public criticism is justified in law unless actual malice is clearly proved. It is quite true, as I have already pointed out, that in *Campbell v. Spottiswoode* Sir Alexander Cockburn, and with him the Court of Queen's Bench, ruled differently, but within three years, in the case of *Hunter v. Sharp*, that great judge entirely disavowed his former opinion, and the Court of Queen's Bench, under his presidency, reaffirmed without a dissentient his, master view. In *Wason v. Walter* again, the judges of the same court were unanimous in holding that everybody is privileged when discussing matters of public interest. The Court of common Pleas in *Henwood v. Harrison* arrived at identically the same conclusion as the Court of Queen's Bench did in *Wason v. Walter*. The only two courts therefore in which the matter has been fully discussed of late years are unanimous upon this point. *Henwood v. Harrison* is peculiarly valuable. There in the privilege of a newspaper was pronounced to be identical with the privilege of a master giving a character to a servant, which was the precise illustration employed in *Campbell v. Spottiswoode* in 1863 to distinguish between what was privilege and what was not. In short, since 1866 the English Courts have, to all appearance, been unanimous that public comment on a public man in the absence of proof of actual malice is to be held privileged. If this be law, a defendant is absolved from the necessity of showing foundation in fact, except in so far as may be used to rebut the charge of malice, if such a charge be alleged against him. It may be urged, as has been the case under almost identical circumstances, that when a defendant seeks the protection afforded by privilege, he must show affirmatively that the act which brings his case within the privilege, and this must be effected by proving that the basis of the comments alleged to be libellous, and the substance of the paragraph, are either true or were honestly believed by the defendant to be true. Although I can, without the least trouble, prove my *bona fides* in this publication, if the observations I have made as to the sufficiency of the defence of privilege in the absence of actual malice be well founded, all this is quite beside the point. In support of this I quote the decision of the Lords of the Privy Council in *Hart v. Gumpel* (L. R. 10 C. 439). In that case the judge directed the jury with reference to a privileged communication that they were to consider "whether the representations were warranted by facts." But the Privy Council in giving judgment stated that "he should have told them that the action would not lie if the statements were made honestly, and in a belief of their truth, and that the burden was on the plaintiff to prove they were not so made. No such explanation, however, was given. The judge only asked the jury whether the statements were warranted by facts, and whether the representations were warranted by facts. The last question is clearly misstated. In cases of this kind the question is not as upon a plea of the truth of the libel whether the representations are true or warranted by facts; but whether, although they may not be true, the defendant might have honestly believed them to be so, and made them without malice." If my exposition of the law is correct, the onus lies on the prosecution to prove actual malice, and if they do not succeed in doing so, I submit it is your Lordship's duty to direct a verdict of "not guilty" to be returned. I would ask whether your Lordship is with me on that point?

The Chief Justice:—I am afraid I am unable to go so far as that, Mr. Francis-Smith.

The defendant:—Gentlemen of the jury, a few words and I have done. I have to ask you to dismiss from your minds anything you may have heard about this case outside the court—all such nonsense as the bets of a hundred to one that I was to be sent to gaol for twelve months. I would also ask you to set aside the turgid eloquence of the learned barrister. You have to decide on the issues laid before you, and I feel quite confident that your verdict will be fairly considered and justly given. I ask for nothing more; to that I am justly entitled. The editor of a newspaper is not infallible, and there is no doubt that in my criticisms of various men and things I have erred frequently, but I have always written honestly and in accordance with my convictions. Where I have erred it has not been owing to malice, but through errors of judgment. If I have ever slandered any one it has been done in what I considered the honest performance of my public duties. I am surprised that the learned counsel should have deemed it necessary to suggest such vile reasons for the alleged malice. I am sure, Mr. Price, that one, why should I be jealous of Mr. Price's honors as Surveyor-General, such as they are, he has doubtless fairly won, and he is justly entitled to wear them. The slanderous insinuation that I might be paid to make these so-called attacks, the hired bravo with the poisoned dagger, is beneath contempt, and will meet with the abhorrence of all honest men. I am extremely sorry that Mr. Francis forgot himself so far as to make such a base insinuation, but it is only one more error of the almost entire absence of commercial morality from the colony. It was only the other day when going over to Macao, I calmly expressed the conviction that the defence of Governor Hennessy's policy by the *Telegraph* was due to the fact that the paper was subsidised by His Excellency. This resident was an old man, and what he said could not be resented; it could only be explained. And when I informed him that his suppositions were wrong, I then said to him, "I am a fool, for the other side would have given you as much as Hennessy had to give for your support." This gentleman of the jury is a fair instance of the state of commercial morality in Hongkong, and this may account for the insinuations of the learned counsel. In conclusion, let me assure you that so far from my having written this alleged libel out of ill-will to Mr. Price, I did not write it at all. I was at Macao when it was published, and actually knew nothing about it. However, as editor of the paper, I am responsible for the libel, if it be

a libel, and it is on that account I stand here today indicted for a criminal offence. All that I have said I will endeavor to substantiate by evidence, and confidently rely on your returning a verdict of "not guilty."

Defendant then addressed the witnesses, amongst others Dr. Stewart, the acting colonial secretary, and Mr. Price. He wished that all witnesses, including Mr. Price, be asked to leave the Court.

His Lordship said that Mr. Price was the prosecutor, but any difficulty about his hearing the evidence could be obviated by his being called first.

Mr. John Macneile Price was then duly sworn and examined by the Defendant.

You are the Surveyor-General of the Colony?—Yes.

Defendant:—Are you aware of any personal feeling of malice on my part towards you?

Witness:—I have never given you any cause for malice.

Is it not a fact that we have never met nor exchanged words till this time?—It is a fact.

Being personal strangers to each other, can you give any reasonable explanation of the extraordinary malice your counsel ascribes to me?—I cannot, unless it arises from the fact that I have refused to admit your paper into my office, and have told you to discontinue sending it.

You have told me to discontinue sending it?—I gave orders to my clerk to write to you requesting you to discontinue it, and there was some correspondence between us on the subject.

Am I to understand you to swear on your oath that you gave me a letter?—You wrote to my clerk declining to discontinue supplying the paper until you were requested to do so by the Governor or the Colonial Secretary; it was not written to me personally.

You are aware, of course, that it has been my duty frequently?—Yes.

Defendant:—Be good enough to keep quiet. You will have your opportunity of making any remarks you please presently, Mr. Francis.

Witness:—You are aware that I have considered it my duty frequently to write adverse criticisms upon your public acts?

Witness:—I do not know what you may consider it my duty to write, but I know that you have systematically slandered me for months past.

Defendant:—That is not the point.

Witness:—It is the point.

Defendant:—Have I not often adversely criticised your public acts?

Witness:—You have.

Have I ever praised what you have done?—As I never read your paper I cannot say.

You are aware it is the duty of every paper to fearlessly criticise the public acts of any public officer?—I am.

You instructed your clerk to write to me last January?—Yes.

Is this the letter?—I have never seen the letter. I only gave my clerk instructions. I do not know what he wrote.

The defendant then read the letter as follows:—"I am directed by the honorable the Surveyor-General to inform you that he declines to receive the *Hongkong Telegraph* in his department, and will be glad if you will favour this office with your account at your earliest convenience. I remain, &c., WILLIAM GOSBOURNE."

The defendant:—Is that the substance of your instructions?

Witness:—It is.

And you remember receiving a reply to it?—I remember my clerk told me you declined to discontinue it.

I will read you the letter.

The defendant read as follows:—

Hongkong Telegraph Office,
Hongkong, 6th January, 1883.

Sir,—In reply to your letter last received, will you be good enough to inform the Hon. the Surveyor-General that we have received instructions from the Colonial Secretary to supply the Surveyor-General's Department daily with a copy of the *Hongkong Telegraph*, and that we shall continue to do so until the order is countermanded either by the Secretary or his Excellency the Administrator. I am, &c., R. FRASER-SMITH.

Examination continued:—Were you never criticised in the *Hongkong Telegraph* before the 4th January?

Witness:—I believe I have been; I believe I have been systematically libelled by the *Hongkong Telegraph*, but I cannot give dates.

On the receipt of that letter by Mr. Gosbourne I believe you addressed a letter to the Colonial Secretary?—I did.

You remember what you said?—Perfectly.

Will you repeat it for the benefit of the jury?—I consider my communications to the Colonial Secretary are privileged, and do not concern you in any way whatever.

Did you state that I was a convicted criminal pursuing my abandoned career?—I decline to give you any answer on that point.

Defendant:—We will have the letter produced, so it does not matter. Will you give the reason why you ordered the paper to be discontinued when it was ordered to be supplied by the Colonial Secretary?

Witness:—Because I did not consider it respectable.

Why?—Every man is entitled to his opinion; and that was my opinion.

I asked you the reason. Was it not because your acts were severely criticised?—I formed the opinion then, and I have seen no reason to alter that opinion.

Why, you have just said you never see the paper, yet, but some of its contents are often repeated?—I am not a censor.

Was it not because of an article severely criticising your public acts?—It was not.

Will you be good enough to inform the jury as to the custom of your department in carrying out contracts?

Mr. Francis objected to the question on the ground that it was not now competent for the defendant to go into the truth or falsehood of the alleged libel.

The defendant said he was not going into that question, but he would endeavour to show that he was not actuated by malice, and that he had good grounds for advocating an investigation into certain matters.

His Lordship said the defendant was entitled to go into that, as Mr. Francis had made malice one of the strings of his bow. It would be his duty hereafter to tell the jury how far they were to consider the question of malice.

Mr. Price then, in answer to the defendant's questions, said that when public works were to be undertaken there were two courses which were followed—one was to advertise for tenders in the *Government Gazette*, and to send round circulars to the principal contractors, or to have the work done by measurement in accordance with a schedule of prices in the *Government Offices*. In all works tenders were not advertised for in the *Government Gazette*; it was not necessary, but in large works, such as that at Causeway Bay, or the Observatory, it was the invariable rule to advertise for tenders unless there was some special reason against it. The whole thing was governed by the possibility of ascertaining the cost of any work beforehand. The acceptance of any contract rested with the Governor, but he could not say that he had no responsibility with respect to them, since he sent his report upon the tenders to His Excellency, who might, perhaps, be influenced by it. A tender accepted without competition would not be an irregularity, as a great many contracts were given without any competition. That was only done where the price of the contract was below the Government scale already mentioned, and would not be given otherwise. There was no truth in the paragraph the defendant had quoted, from the *China Mail* as to the Government paying 50

per cent. more for their work than private individuals. A great many public contracts were given without competition every day. The laying of the foundation of the new Lunatic Asylum had been so given to Mr. Chan King. The work was done by the Government, and the new masonry at Shok Tong Tsui was a parallel case, but it was not a fact that the prices paid for these works were much above their actual value. Specifications were prepared for the whole of them. There was nothing to prevent any respectable contractor from doing the work, providing that he did it according to the schedule, and gave certain guarantees. The work for the Observatory was put out to public competition, Sun Shing being the successful contractor.

His Lordship said he did not see how it would avail the defendant to go into these matters unless he showed that he was aware of them at the time he wrote the article in question.

The defendant said he was aware of them at the time; the contracts were settled in 1882.

His Lordship said he did not see what use the defendant wished to make of them in his defence.

The defendant said he wished to show that he was not actuated by malice, but that he had acted on good grounds.

His Lordship said he was not inclined to check the examination unless an objection was raised.

Mr. Francis—I am quite prepared to give the defendant as much rope as he needs, my Lord; he will only make one use of it.

The defendant:—My only object is to elicit the truth.

Mr. Francis:—And thereby hang yourself.

The defendant:—If I hang myself that is my own affair.

Examination continued:—It was hardly likely that when the invitation for the tender was issued it was intimated that the work would have to be done within four months, but witness could not remember whether it was stated now, as it was published nearly a year ago.

By Mr. Francis:—Witness was not in the colony, but was away on leave when the article appeared in the *Telegraph* as to the payment of contractors, alluded to by the defendant.

Dr. Stewart was then called, and in answer to the defendant, he said:—I am acting for the Colonial Secretary at present. I have been subpoenaed to produce certain documents. I produce a letter dated January 8th, 1883, from the Surveyor-General to the acting Colonial Secretary.

The following letter was then read in court:—

Public Works Department,
8th January, 1883.

Sir, I have the honor to transmit you the enclosed copy of a letter from the editor of the *Hongkong Telegraph* in reply to a request from me that he should discontinue sending his paper, and that he should be good enough to countermand the order for the paper.

I find that the *Hongkong Telegraph* is supplied to me under the authority of C. S. O. 1724 of 1881, and I have therefore requested you to request the Secretary to be good enough to countermand the order for the paper.

Apert from the fact that the subscription to this newspaper is a public matter, and that it is a matter of decency and decorum, and I cannot but think that some responsibility attaches to the Government for the fact that it is supplied to me under a month to a convicted criminal in his abandoned career. I have, &c., (Sd.) J. M. PRICE, Surveyor-General.

The letter enclosed was the one given above by the defendant, declining to discontinue supplying the paper.

Stuart M. Fraser-Smith was then called, and said he was manager and sub-editor of the *Hongkong Telegraph*, and in that capacity all copy for the paper passed through his hands, and he knew the names of the writers of the whole of it. The copy for the paragraph containing the alleged libel passed through his hands, and it was not in the colony at the time it was published. He was acquainted with the circumstances which led to the writing of the paragraph; they were as follows:—A gentleman connected with the Surveyor-General's Office called in at the office of the *Hongkong Telegraph* one morning about nine o'clock. Amongst other things this person and the defendant were speaking of the common events in the Colony, and touching the Tytam Waterworks his brother casually remarked to him, "You will doubtless make a good thing out of these waterworks."

"Oh I shall not be so much as you, as we are thinking I shall do so well either, but I don't very smartly looked after now, and Mr. Price likes to keep all the good things to his own cheek." It was that conversation which led to the writing and publishing of this paragraph. Witness had frequently had conversations with members of the Surveyor-General's Department about alleged irregularities; they were almost daily, for it was his business to meet people and sound them. He recollected the article of the 26th May 1882. It was written under the following circumstances:—A member of the Surveyor-General's department called and asked him to get certain outstanding accounts due to contractors to that department paid; he suggested that he (witness) should go round to see, or a dozen of the contractors and make a bargain with them that if he succeeded in getting in their accounts within a fortnight or some such time, they should pay him a percentage upon the amount to recoup him for his trouble. Witness said he would not undertake the work on those terms, but he would do it for nothing if the contractors would satisfy him that he was doing it upon a sure foundation. The person took him to two of the contractors who satisfied him that they had been waiting six or eight months for the payment of their accounts, so he went no further, but drew up a scheme for an article which the defendant wrote. The next forenoon the person told witness that the Acting Surveyor-General had been inquiring in the department, as to who had given the information, and asked him not to disclose his source of information. The next day this person told witness that Mr. Marsh, then Administrator, had written down to Mr. Dowling, to inquire whether the allegations contained in the paragraph were true, and that the accounts of the Surveyor-General's man also told him that the reason the contractors had been kept waiting for their money was because they could not afford to give a gratuity to the man in charge of the pay department, and they were put off with flimsy excuses from day to day. He did not recollect the name of the contractor who told him this; but he knew him, and had seen him since that matter, when he chinned witness, and told him he was his very good friend for getting him his money; he also invited witness to go to his house, and "cushawed" him in a box of cigars.

Witness was about a good deal amongst the Chinese and European members of the community; among all of whom it was common talk that squeezing and bribery did exist in the Surveyor-General's Department. He had very often heard it said, and he had good reasons for believing it existed.

Witness examined by Mr. Francis:—Witness was sub-editor and manager of the *Hongkong Telegraph*, and he did not do any proof reading, acted as a share reporter, and general collector of all the little bits in the colony. He was a good deal in the streets, but he was not in the habit of being absent from the office from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. The conversation with the gentleman from the Surveyor-General's Department occupied about a quarter of an hour; he came to see witness, but the defendant heard all the conversation which had been detailed, in fact it arose on his brother's question. It was done quite naturally, he would not say promiscuously.

Mr. Francis:—Who was the gentleman from the Surveyor-General's Department?

Witness:—That I decline to say.

Mr. Francis:—That name must be given.

His Lordship:—You must give the name now you have gone so far.

Witness:—It was Mr. Edward Rose, foreman of the Waterworks.

Mr. Francis:—Had Mr. Rose anything in the waterworks with the Tytam waterworks?

Witness:—I don't know; excepting perhaps with the water.

That would be after it reached here?—Yes.

But with the works in execution at Tytam had he anything to do, you who know all the ins and outs of the Government Departments?—I do not know all the ins and outs.

Do you mean to say Mr. Rose made use of the words you have given?—Yes.

Will you oblige me with some of the names of the gentlemen in the Surveyor-General's Department with whom you have had conversations respecting the bribery in the department?

Witness gave several names of members of the department, but denied having said he had received any information from them.

Mr. Francis appealed to his Lordship's notes.

His Lordship said he did not think the witness had said he had received any information from them.

Mr. Francis:—Who was the person who came to you to induce you to call attention to the fact that the contractors had not been paid?

Witness:—Mr. Rose was the person.

Did you ever take any trouble to inquire among the heads of departments as to the truth of these reports which you heard?—Which of them?

To the Surveyor-General.

Witness:—I did not think that necessary because I had got sufficient information from the contractors' own mouth to work upon.

Can you give me the names of any of the gentlemen who have given you information as to squeezing in the Surveyor-General's Department?—I did not say any one had given me information of squeezing; I only said I had had conversations with them.

Defendant:—It would be well if the learned counsel confined himself to legitimate cross-examination. He is trying to put words in witness's mouth which were never spoken.

Will you give me the names of some of those who have told you about squeezing?—Yes, I can mention a dozen, or 30 or 40.

Conversation with nearly every one in the colony, I suppose. Will you give us the names of two or three in connection with the Surveyor-General's Department?—I did not say I received any information of squeezing from anyone in the department.

Well, let us have two or three other names.

Witness:—Mr. Thibvenin, the wine merchant, for one.

Did he give you any information?—I don't say information; we had some conversation. I don't see what you wish me to tell, but I will endeavour to answer your questions. We were comparing the salaries of the members of the Surveyor-General's Department, and wondering how a person with \$60 or \$65 a month managed to pay \$20 a month for rent, keep a family of seven or eight, and having always from common beer to the best champagne in his house, and do this without a margin of profit. That was the substance of it. It was a problem in social economy we were trying to work out.

And did you arrive at a satisfactory conclusion according to your own lights?—We arrived at the conclusion that the person did not pay for the things he got, otherwise he had means of getting money which were not legitimate.

Have you any recollection of the date of this conversation with Mr. Rose about the Surveyor-General keeping all the good things to himself?

I could not tell you; it was shortly before the article appeared, but it was probably not on the same day; it is unlikely the article would have been written on the same day.

What is the reason you remember about that article so well?—Because when my brother came back from Macao he gave me a good winking about it. If he had been at home it would most likely have been torn up or thrown into the waste paper basket.

Can you give me the day he went to Macao?

I cannot.

You cannot remember the day?—No.

From your fund of information can you give us the name of the writer of the letter signed "Hudibras"?—Yes.

Will you do so?

The defendant:—You are not called upon to do anything of the kind.

Witness:—Am I bound to answer a question that will criminate myself?

His Lordship:—Are you prepared to state that the answer will criminate you?

Witness:—I have no objection to state on oath that the answer would criminate myself.

Mr. Francis:—And did your precious brother see it before it went in?

The defendant:—I protest, my Lord, against this uncalled for impertinence. I think it ill becomes the learned counsel to use such an expression towards a defendant in his cross-examination of any witness.

The Chief Justice:—I don't consider, Mr. Francis, you are justified in making use of such an expression.

The learned counsel made no reply to his Lordship's admonition.

Mr. Francis to witness:—Did your brother see the letter before it was inserted?

Witness:—Yes, he saw it in the proof, and he wrote the foot-note.

Is there any person but yourself who would be eliminated by any disclosure about the author or writer of the letter signed "Hudibras"?—No.

Can you point to any article in the *Hongkong Telegraph* about that time entirely your own composition?—Yes.

Do you write the bulk of the correspondence which appears in the *Telegraph*?—I do not think I am bound to answer that question; it is only an interior detail of business.

Mr. Francis:—Only an interior detail of business; that will do for me.

Defendant:—You had better answer him; there is no objection to your answering the question. Lum Kam Chi said—I am a contractor, not a Government contractor when I get work I do it. I do not remember about his having had some conversation with the last witness and Mr. Rose it is so long ago. How can I remember it now? I have a good deal of work to do.

Defendant:—Did you complain to Mr. Rose about not being paid for your Government work?

Witness:—No, I did not; I do not remember it. If it is a fact you were kept waiting six months for your pay at one time?—It is so long, how can I remember?

Defendant:—I don't think it is any good wasting valuable time on this man; he evidently does not wish to answer.

By his Lordship:—The defendant's brother came to me two days ago and asked me to go to his office, but I did not go.

Defendant:—I call no more witnesses, my Lord.

Mr. Francis, as the defendant was beginning his address to the jury, asked for an adjournment until the following morning so as to enable him to call re-butting evidence. He was sorry to prolong the trial, but he had no opportunity of knowing what evidence was to be produced, he could not be prepared for it.

The Chief Justice:—I think the request a reasonable one. You see, Mr. Fraser-Smith, the learned prosecutor could not possibly have known that this evidence was to be brought forward.

The defendant:—I offer no objections to an adjournment, my Lord.

The Court was then adjourned until Thursday morning at 10 o'clock, the Chief Justice remarking to the jury that the case would certainly be finished in the course of the day.

Today's Advertisements.

THE CHINA AND MANILA STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.
FOR MANILA (DIRECT).
"ESMERALDA,"
Captain Wright, will be despatched for the above Port, TO-MORROW, the 1st December, at FIVE P.M.
For Freight or Passage, apply to
RUSSELL & Co.,
General Managers.
Hongkong, 30th November, 1883. [893]

THE CHINA AND MANILA STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.
FOR MANILA, VIA AMOY.
"DIAMANTE,"
Captain Cullen, will be despatched for the above Ports, on MONDAY, the 3rd December, at FIVE P.M.
For Freight or Passage, apply to
RUSSELL & Co.,
General Managers.
Hongkong, 30th November, 1883. [894]

FOR SYDNEY, MELBOURNE AND ADELAIDE.
(Calling at PORT DARWIN and QUEENSLAND PORTS, and taking through Cargo to NEW ZEALAND, NEW CALEDONIA, TASMANIA and FIJI).
THE Eastern and Australian Steamship Company's Steamers.
"MENMUIR,"
Captain W. Ellis, will be despatched as above on FRIDAY, the 14th December, at FOUR P.M.
Parcels (all of which must be sent to our Office) will be received up to 4 P.M., on the 13th December.
Contents and Value of Packages must be declared.
For Freight or Passage, apply to
GIBB, LIVINGSTON & Co.,
Agents.
Hongkong, 30th November, 1883. [895]

NOTICE.
ALL PERSONS having any CLAIMS AGAINST DR. VON DER HORCK are requested to send full particulars of the same to the undersigned.
J. M. ARMSTRONG.
Hongkong, 30th November, 1883. [896]

NOTICE.
FROM THIS DATE we will also carry on the Business of SHARE and GENERAL BROKERS in this Colony.
E. CA SILVA & Co.,
General Commission Agents and Auctioneers.
Hongkong, 30th November, 1883. [891]

BRITISH NORTH BORNEO COMPANY.
NOTICE OF REMOVAL.
THE BRITISH NORTH BORNEO IMMIGRATION OFFICE has been REMOVED to No. 6, QUEEN'S ROAD CENTRAL, lately occupied by the Pacific Mail Steamship Company.
FREDERICK RICKARDS.
Hongkong, 30th November, 1883. [892]

VICTORIA HOTEL,
22, PRAYA CENTRAL.
PROPRIETORS, DORABJEE & HING KEE,
LATE LESSEES OF THE HONGKONG HOTEL.
THE Community of Hongkong are respectfully informed that the VICTORIA HOTEL will be OPENED on SATURDAY, the 1st December, 1883.
Hongkong, 24th November, 1883. [881]

VICTORIA HOTEL,
PRAYA CENTRAL, HONGKONG.
PROPRIETORS, DORABJEE & HING KEE,
LATE LESSEES OF THE HONGKONG HOTEL.
THIS FIRST CLASS HOTEL situated on the PRAYA CENTRAL in the centre of the principal Business localities, commands a magnificent view of the Harbour and Surrounding Scenery. From its detached position, perfect ventilation has been secured, and the whole of the Rooms being COMMODIOUS, FURNISHED with every requisite and comfort, afford most desirable accommodation.
The BAR, BILLIARD ROOM, and DINING ROOMS, are fitted up in a Superior manner, and are all under European Supervision and Management.
The TABLE D'HOTE is supplied with every delicacy of the Season, and most satisfactory attendance. WINES and LIQUORS of the Best Qualities and Brands only are supplied. Arrangements for BALLS, BANQUETS, DINNERS and PICNICS, made on the most reasonable terms. The long and almost exclusive experience of the Proprietors, and the excellent reputation they have gained, are a sufficient guarantee that satisfaction will be given in this branch.
With every facility for making suitable arrangements at Reasonable Prices, either for permanent or weekly BOARDERS, the Proprietors confidently appeal to the community of Hongkong for a continuance of the generous patronage bestowed on them during the past eleven years.
VICTORIA HOTEL,
22, Praya Central, Hongkong.
Hongkong, 20th November, 1883. [868]

C. L. THEVENIN,
WINE AND SPIRIT MERCHANT,
HONGKONG HOTEL BUILDINGS,
HAS FOR SALE
A FINE ASSORTMENT
OF WHITE AND RED BURGUNDIES, GRAND HERMITAGE, CHAMBERTIN, POMMARD, RICHBOURG, CHABLIS, Pinots and Quarts.
OLD PORT, SHERRY, WHISKEY, COGNAC, ASSORTED LIQUORS AND SYRUPS, PERFUMERY, &c., &c., &c.
Hongkong, 17th October, 1883. [780]

The Hongkong Telegraph.

SIX DOLLARS
PER QUARTER.

No. 574.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1883.

For Sale.

LANE, CRAWFORD & Co.,
HAVE RECEIVED A CONSIGNMENT
of
BEART'S CHOICE SUFFOLK

BREAKFAST
BACON,
HAMS

AND
BATH CHAPS.

LANE, CRAWFORD & Co.

Hongkong, 28th November, 1883. [340]

Auctions.

PUBLIC AUCTION
OF
VALUABLE OLD CHINESE
PORCELAINS, CURIOS,
&c., &c., &c.

THE Undersigned has received instructions
to Sell by Public Auction,
TO-MORROW,
the 1st December, 1883, at Two P.M., at his
Sales Rooms, Pedlar's Wharf Building,
A VERY VALUABLE COLLECTION OF
OLD CHINESE PORCELAINS, CURIOS,
&c., &c., &c.
The same having just arrived in this Colony
from Peking, having been collected in the
Northern Provinces of China, and
Comprising—

'Choice Specimens of VASES, JARS, BOWLS,
CUPS, PLATES, DISHES, &c., of different
descriptions of the reigns of "KIEN-LUNG,"
"YUNG-CHUEN," "KANG-HI," and the
"MING" DYNASTY; also One Piece of Very
Old Porcelain of the "SUNG" DYNASTY,
IMPERIAL PORCELAINS, JADES,
CLOISONNES, CURIOS, &c., &c., &c.
Catalogues will be issued prior to Sale, and
the above Articles will be on view on FRIDAY
NEXT.

TERMS OF SALE.—As customary.
G. R. LAMBERT,
Auctioneer.
Hongkong, 28th November, 1883. [886]

PUBLIC AUCTION.

THE Undersigned has received instructions
from the MORTGAGEE, to Sell by Public
Auction, on

SATURDAY,
the 8th December, 1883, at 3 O'CLOCK P.M.,
at the Premises,
A VALUABLE LEASEHOLD PROPERTY,
SITUATE IN
THIRD STREET & HIGH STREET,
Victoria, Hongkong,
comprising—

All that Piece of GROUND registered as
INLAND LOT No. 685, and measuring on
the North 105 feet, on the South 105 feet,
on the East 150 feet and on the West 150 feet,
and containing in the whole 15,750 square
feet, together with the Buildings thereon.
Held for the residue of a term of 999 years at
the annual Crown Rent of \$104.12.
The Property is sold subject to the existing
tenancies thereof.
For Further Particulars and Conditions of
Sale, apply to

CREASY EWENS,
Solicitor for the Mortgagee,
or to
J. M. ARMSTRONG,
Auctioneer.

Hongkong, 27th November, 1883. [884]

PUBLIC AUCTION.

MR. J. M. GUEDES has received instructions
to Sell by Public Auction, on

TUESDAY,
the 11th December, 1883, at 2.30 O'CLOCK P.M.,
at the Premises,
A VALUABLE LEASEHOLD PROPERTY,
Situating in Rosario Street and Bridges Street,
Victoria, in the Colony of Hongkong,
Comprising—

All those Pieces or Parcels of GROUND
Registered in the Land Office as Section A
of INLAND LOT No. 403, the Remaining
Portion of INLAND LOT No. 403 and Section
C of INLAND LOT No. 400, as the
same Premises are respectively held for the
residues of two several and respective terms
of 999 years and 999 years.
The Property will be offered for sale in the
following lots, viz—

Lot 1.—The Tenement Nos. 78, 80, and 82,
Bridges Street, containing an area of 2,800
square feet or thereabouts.

Lot 2.—The Tenement Nos. 6 and 7, Rosario
Street, containing an area of 1,445 square
feet or thereabouts.

Lot 3.—The Tenement No. 31, Bridges Street,
containing an area of 609 square feet or
thereabouts.

The Property is sold subject to the existing
tenancies thereof respectively.
For Further Particulars of the Property and
Conditions of Sale, apply to

BREKTON, WOTTON, & DEACON,
Solicitors for the Vendor,
35, Queen's Road,
Hongkong,
or to
J. M. GUEDES,
Auctioneer,
Hongkong, 29th November, 1883. [890]

J. M. GUEDES.

HOUSE AND LAND BROKER,
AUCTIONEER AND COMMISSION
AGENT.
No. 35, WILKINSON STREET, HONGKONG.
Hongkong, 29th November, 1883.

Insurances.

THE Undersigned have been appointed
AGENTS to the NEW YORK BOARD
of UNDERWRITERS.

ARNHOLD, KARBERG & Co.,
Hongkong, 15th June, 1881.
RECORD of AMERICAN and FOREIGN
SHIPPING.
ARNHOLD, KARBERG & Co.,
Agents.
Hongkong, 15th June, 1881. [470]

THE STRAITS INSURANCE COMPANY,
LIMITED.

THE Undersigned having been appointed
AGENTS of the above Company are
prepared to grant Policies on MARINE RISKS
to all parts of the world at CURRENT RATES.
ARNHOLD, KARBERG & Co.
Hongkong, 3rd November, 1883. [827]

NOTICE.

THE MAN ON INSURANCE COMPANY,
LIMITED.

(CAPITAL SUBSCRIBED.....\$1,000,000.)
The above Company is prepared to accept
MARINE RISKS at CURRENT RATES on GOODS,
&c. Policies granted to all Parts of the world
payable at any of its Agencies.

WOO LIN YUEN,
Secretary.

HEAD OFFICE,
No. 2, QUEEN'S ROAD WEST,
Hongkong, 1st February, 1882. [106]

YANGTSE INSURANCE
ASSOCIATION.

CAPITAL (Fully Paid-up).....Tls. 420,000.00
PERMANENT RESERVE.....Tls. 230,000.00
SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.....Tls. 318,235.56

TOTAL CAPITAL and
ACCUMULATIONS, 31st
March, 1883.....Tls. 968,235.56

DIRECTORS,
F. D. HITCH, Esq., Chairman,
C. LUCAS, Esq., Wm. MEYERINK, Esq.,
A. J. M. INVERARITY, Esq., G. H. WHEELER, Esq.

HEAD OFFICE—SHANGHAI.
Messrs. RUSSELL & Co., Secretaries.

LONDON BRANCH.
Messrs. BARING BROTHERS & Co.,
Bankers.

RICHARD BLACKWELL, Esq., Agent,
68 and 69, Cornhill, E.C.

POLICIES granted on MARINE RISKS to all
parts of the World.
Subject to a charge of 12 per cent. for Interest
on Shareholders' Capital, all the PROFITS of the
UNDERWRITING BUSINESS are annually dis-
tributed among all Contributors of Business (whether
Shareholders or not) in proportion to the
premium paid by them.

RUSSELL & Co.,
Agents.
Hongkong, 25th May, 1883. [83]

GENERAL NOTICE.

THE ON TAI INSURANCE COMPANY,
(LIMITED).

CAPITAL TAELS 600,000, EQUAL \$813,333.33.
RESERVE FUND.....\$70,853.27.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.
LEE SING, Esq., LEE YAT LAU, Esq.,
LO YUOK MOON, Esq., CHU CHIK NUNG, Esq.

MANAGER.—HO AMEL.

MARINE RISKS on GOODS, &c., taken at
CURRENT RATES to all parts of the world.

HEAD OFFICE, 8 & 9, PRAYA WEST.
Hongkong, 1st September, 1882. [670]

UNION INSURANCE SOCIETY OF
CANTON, LIMITED.

NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.
A SECOND and FINAL BONUS of Five
per cent. on Contributions and DIVI-
DEND of EIGHTEEN DOLLARS and TWENTY-
NINE CENTS per SHARE for the year 1883, will
be Payable on MONDAY, the 22nd instant.
Warrants may be had on application at the
Office of the Society on and after that date.
By Order of the Board,

DOUGLAS JONES,
Acting Secretary.
Hongkong, 22nd October, 1883. [794]

CHINA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY,
LIMITED.

ADJUSTMENT OF BONUS FOR THE
YEAR 1883.

SHAREHOLDERS are hereby requested to
send in to this Office a List of their Con-
tributions of Premium for the year ended 31st
December last, in order that the proportion of
Profit for that year to be paid as Bonus to Con-
tributors may be arranged. Returns not sent in
before the 30th November next, will be made up
by the Company, and no subsequent claims or
alterations will be allowed.
By Order of the Directors,

JAS. B. COUGHTRIE,
Secretary.
Hongkong, 1st September, 1883. [673]

FOR SALE.

GOOD BORDEAUX CLARET.....\$3.50
in Cases of 12 Bottles, at.....\$3.50
WOLFE SCHIEDAM SCHNAPPS.....\$6.00
in Cases of 12 Bottles at.....\$6.00

Also,
Some PRIME HOLLAND Jenever in
Stone Bottles, and some POMERANZEN
BITTERS.

Double Barreled Breech Loading GUNS,
RIFLES, REVOLVERS, CARTRIDGES and
SHOT, &c., &c., &c.

Very Fresh ITALIAN CONDENSED MILK
in Cases of 4 Dozens, at \$6.50 per Case.

J. F. SCHEFFER,
21 and 23, Pottinger Street.
Hongkong, 16th November, 1883. [862]

Intimations.

EX S.S. "IRAQUADDY" & "GLENEAGLES."

ROSE & CO.
ARE NOW SHOWING A CHOICE AND ELEGANT ASSORTMENT
OF
MANTLES, JACKETS, ULSTERS,
DRESS MATERIALS
AND
OTHER GOODS SUITABLE FOR THE SEASON.
ALSO,
A NEW DELIVERY OF

FELT AND BEAVER HATS.

ROSE & Co.,
31 AND 33, QUEEN'S ROAD.

Hongkong, 10th November, 1883. [716]

UNDER the heading "Exhibits to the Cork Exhibition, Ireland," "THE CORK
CONSTITUTION, No. 13,025, dated Saturday, July 14th 1883, says—

MESSRS. TURNBULL JUNR. & SOMERVILLE,
"Valletta, Malta, exhibit in a tastefully arranged case, samples of their famous 'Kalaar-
I-Hind' Cigarettes, and inasmuch as a revolution in the habit of smoking is now setting
in, this exhibit should prove attractive to all lovers of the 'fragrant weed.' Instead of
strong Tobacco, often used in too strong pipes, and full flavoured Cigars, the mild
Cigarette is rapidly coming into vogue. Those now on view in the Exhibition are highly
spoken of by the Press, vendors, and smokers."

SOLE AGENCY,
"NOVELTY STORE,"
MARINE HOUSE, QUEEN'S ROAD.
Hongkong, 26th September, 1883. [731]

SAYLE & CO'S
SHOW-ROOMS.

WE INTEND MAKING A SPECIAL SHOW

TO-MORROW

AND FOLLOWING DAYS

OF

LADIES' AND CHILDREN'S CHEAP TRIMMED AND UNTRIMMED, FELT,

BEAVER, AND STRAW HATS,"

JUST LANDED EX "GLENARTNEY."

SAYLE & CO.,
VICTORIA EXCHANGE, HONGKONG.

Hongkong, 21st November, 1883. [730]

KELLY & WALSH'S
SELECTED LIST OF WORKS OF REFERENCE.

CRABBE'S English Synonyms.
Rogers' Thesaurus of English Words.
Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable.
Bartlett's Shakespere Phrase Book.
Every Man his own Lawyer.
Stanton's Chess Player's Hand Book.
Companion.
Anderson's Mercantile Letters.
Scott's Shipowner's Telegraph Code, with
Supplement.
Wetmore's Commercial Telegraph Code,
specially adapted for the China Trade.
Oliver's Manual of Shipping Law.
Fili's Manual of Social and Business Forms.
Tate's Modern Cambrist.
Collins's History, Laws and Practice of Banking.
Money on Tea Cultivation.
Clark's Manual of Rules, Tables and Data
for Mechanical Engineers.
Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 1883
Edition.
Ogilvie's Imperial Dictionary, 5 vols. Imp. 8vo.
Chamber's Etymological Dictionary.
Routledge's Desk Dictionary, (a tiny, but very
complete volume, portable enough for the
waistcoat pocket.

Ogilvie's Smaller English Dictionary—the
best \$1 Dictionary in the market.
Green's The Gun and its development, with
notes on Shooting.
Stonchenge's The Modern Sportsman's Gun
and Rifle.
Youatt on the Horse.
Day's The Race Horse in Training.
Captain Haye's Horse Training and Manage-
ment.
Captain Haye's Riding on the Flat and across
Country.
Hopkin's Manual of Marine Insurance.
Society Small Talk.
Manners and Tone of Good Society.
Elements of Good Society.
Cavendish on Whist.
Dutton on Billiards.
Hoyle's Book of Games.
Watt's Graceful Riding.
Pitman's Complete System of Phonography.
MacLeod's Theory and Practice of Banking.
Kwong 'Ki Chin's Dictionary of English
Phrases.
Carleton's Condensed Encyclopedia and Hand-
book of Information.
Gossip's The Chess Player's Manual.

JUST LANDED.
MASON AND HAMLIN ORGANS.
Specially Manufactured for the Climate. We offer these instruments for the same prices at
which they are sold in America. Illustrated Price Lists on application.
KELLY & WALSH—SOLE AGENTS.
KELLY & WALSH—HONGKONG.
Hongkong, 12th November, 1883. [560]

W. BREWER.

HAS LATELY RECEIVED.

CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR CARDS

IN GREAT VARIETY.

LETT'S DIARIES, FOR 1884.

GOLDEN CLOUD TOBACCO.
OLD JUDGE TOBACCO.
AMERICAN and RUSSIAN CIGARETTES.
CIGARETTE and CIGAR CASES in great variety.
THE SMOKERS SET, in Brass.
GROTESQUE BRASS ASH TRAYS.

NEW PHOTO FRAMES for Promenade Photographs.
EASEL PHOTOGRAPH ALBUMS.
PHOTOGRAPH ALBUMS in great variety and at all Prices.
POCKET BOOKS, PURSES, CARD CASES and BLOTTERS in all kinds of Leathers.
A Quantity of NOVELTIES in PLUSH and BRASS GOODS.
NEW MECHANICAL TOYS.

W. BREWER,
QUEEN'S ROAD.
Hongkong, 6th November, 1883. [724]

Amusements.

THEATRE ROYAL,
CITY HALL HONGKONG.

UNDER THE DISTINGUISHED PATRONAGE OF
HIS EXCELLENCY MAJOR-GENERAL
SARGENT C.B.
Commander-in-Chief of H.M. Land Forces
in China.
LESSEES.....Messrs. DAVIS & D'ANGELIS.

TO-MORROW EVENING,
(SATURDAY, THE 1ST DECEMBER.)

THE LOFTUS TROUPE
WILL PRESENT
H. J. BYRON'S
CELEBRATED SOCIETY COMEDY

"OUR BOYS."

This famous comedy enjoyed the longest and
most successful run in the City of London of
any Production of the English Stage, being
played at the Vaudeville Theatre over fifteen
hundred consecutive nights, and has been played
with great success by the LOFTUS TROUPE in
the principal cities of South Africa and America.

CAST.

Sir Geoffrey Champneys (a Country Magnate).....Mr. JEFF. D'ANGELIS.
Talbot Champneys (his Son).....Mr. C. J. BARBER.

Perkyn Middlewick, of Devonshire House (a retired Butcherman).....Mr. F. W. OAKLAND.
Charles Middlewick (his Son).....Mr. B. O'BRIEN.

Kempster (Sir Geoffrey's Man Servant).....Mr. J. W. ALLEN.
Poddles (Middlewick's Butler).....Mr. HOWARD.

Violet Melrose (an Heiress).....Miss MINNIE NORDT.
Mary Melrose (the poor Cousin).....Miss VICTORIA LOFTUS.

Clarissa Champneys (Sir Geoffrey's Sister).....Miss FLORENCE CON-
LIFFE.
Beinda (a Lodging-House Slave).....Miss DOLLY LOFTUS.

ACT 1.—At the Butcherman's.
SCENE—Perkyn Middlewick's Country House.

ACT 2.—At the Baronet's.
SCENE—Drawing-Room at Sir Geoffrey's.

Seven months are supposed to have elapsed.
ACT 3.—Mrs. Patcham's Three-Pair Back.
SCENE—Third Floor at a London Lodging-House.

TUESDAY, the 4th December,
GRAND FASHIONABLE NIGHT.

By Command of His Excellency the Governor,
SIR GEO. BOWEN, G.C.M.G.,
GILBERT and SULLIVAN'S COMIC OPERA
H.M.S. "PINAFORE"
will be repeated.

This Performance being a repeat will not
count as a Subscription Night.

Box Plan now open at Messrs. KELLY &
WALSH'S.

J. CHAS. DAVIS,
Manager,
BARTLEY O'BRIEN,
Agent.
Hongkong, 28th November, 1883. [883]

Notices of Firms.

NOTICE.

FROM this date Messrs. RUSSELL & Co.
will conduct our Business at this Port, and
all Communications should be addressed to them.
Messrs. RUSSELL & Co. will also act as Agents
at this Port for our line of Steamers.
GEO. R. STEVENS & Co.
Hongkong, 1st August, 1883. [606]

To be Let.

TO LET.

THE PREMISES now occupied by us,
No. 11, Queen's Road Central.
For further Particulars, apply to Messrs.
RUSSELL & Co.
GEO. R. STEVENS & Co.
Hongkong, 1st August, 1883. [607]

TO LET.

"BISNEE VILLA" Pokfulam, Furnished.
No. 4, SEYMOUR TERRACE.

Apply to
DAVID SASSOON, SONS & Co.
Hongkong, 7th November, 1883. [7]

For Sale.

FOR SALE.

G. H. MUMM & Co.'s CHAMPAGNE.
QUARTS.....\$22 per Case.
PINTS.....\$23 per Case.
Apply to
MELCHERS & Co.
Hongkong, 2nd March, 1882. [8]

J. AND R. TENNENT'S ALE AND
PORTER.

DAVID CORSAIR & SONS'
MERCHANT NAVY
NAVY BOILED
LONG FLAX
CROWN
ARNHOLD, KARBERG & Co.
Hongkong, 15th June, 1881. [459]

RODERICK DHU WHISKY.

A PURE Fine Flavoured Blend, Equal in
Bouquet and Style to the
FINEST FRENCH BRANDY.

SOLE AGENT FOR HONGKONG,
C. L. THEVENIN,
Hongkong Hotel Building.
Hongkong, 19th October, 1883. [767]

G. FALCONER & CO.
WATCH AND CHRONOMETER
MANUFACTURERS
AND
JEWELLERS

NAUTICAL INSTRUMENTS
CHARTS AND BOOKS.
No. 45, QUEEN'S ROAD CENTRAL. [471]

Shipping.

STEAMERS.

THE AUSTRALASIA, CHINA, JAPAN
AND STRAITS STEAMSHIP
COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR SYDNEY, MELBOURNE AND
ADELAIDE, VIA SINGAPORE.
(Calling at PORT DARWIN and QUEENSLAND
PORTS, and taking through Cargo to
NEW ZEALAND and TASMANIAN
PORTS, NEW CALEDONIA
and Fiji.)

THE Steamship
"SUEZ"

Captain Dodd, will be despatched as above, on
TUESDAY, the 4th December, at FOUR P.M.
For Freight or Passage, apply to
RUSSELL & Co.,
General Managers.
Hongkong, 10th November, 1883. [850]

SAILING VESSELS.

FOR NEW YORK.

THE 3/3 L. I. American Bark
"JAMES A. BORLAND,"
J. H. Kent, Master, will load here for the above
Port, and will have quick despatch.
For Freight, apply to
ARNHOLD, KARBERG & Co.
Hongkong, 28th November, 1883. [888]

FOR NEW YORK.

THE 3/3 L. I. German Ship
"OTTO,"
Fortmann, Master, will load here for the above
Port, and will have quick despatch.
For Freight, apply to
RUSSELL & Co.
Hongkong, 1st November, 1883. [819]

FOR SAN FRANCISCO.

THE Hawaiian Bark
"LILLY GRACE,"
Hughes, Master, will load here for the above
Port, and will have quick despatch.
This vessel has good accommodation for cabin
passengers.
For Freight or Passage, apply to
RUSSELL & Co.
Hongkong, 17th November, 1883. [866]

Mails.

U. S. MAIL LINE.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.
THROUGH TO NEW YORK, VIA OVER-
LAND RAILWAYS, AND TOUCHING
AT YOKOHAMA, AND SAN
FRANCISCO.

THE U. S. Mail Steamship
"CITY OF RIO DE JANEIRO,"
will be despatched for San Francisco, via Yoko-
hama, with the option of calling at Honolulu, on
MONDAY, the 3rd December, at THREE P.M.
To be followed by the S.S. "CITY OF TOKIO,"
on SATURDAY, the 15th December, at 3 P.M.,
taking Passengers and Freight for Japan, the
United States, and Europe.

Through Bills of Lading issued for trans-
portation to Yokohama and other Japan Ports,
to San Francisco, and Atlantic and Inland
Cities of the United States, via Overland Rail-
ways, to Havana, Trinidad, and Demerara, and
to ports in Mexico, Central and South America,
by the Company's and connecting Steamers.

Through Passage Tickets granted to England,
France, and Germany by all trans-Atlantic lines
of Steamers.

RETURN PASSAGES.—Passengers, who
have paid full fare, re-embarking at San Fran-
cisco for China or Japan (or vice versa) within
six months, will be allowed a discount of 20 per
cent. from Return Fare; if re-embarking within
one year, an allowance of 10 per cent. will be
made from Return Fare. Pre-Paid Return
Passage Orders, available for one year, will be
issued at a Discount of 25 per cent. from Return
Fare. These allowances do not apply to through
fares from China and Japan to Europe.

Freight will be received on board until 4 P.M.
on the 2nd and 3rd December. Parcel Packages will
be received at the Office until 5 P.M. same day;
all Parcel Packages should be marked to ad-
dress in full; value of same is required.

Consular Invoices to accompany Overland
Cargo should be sent to the Company's Offices
in Sealed Envelopes, addressed to the Collector
of Customs at San Francisco.

For further information as to Passage and
Freight, apply to the Agency of the Company,
No. 50A, Queen's Road Central.

F. E. FOSTER,
Agent.
Hongkong, 19th November, 1883. [1]

Consignees.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.
NOTICE.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo per Steamship
"CITY OF RIO DE JANEIRO,"
the above Steamer having arrived, Consignees
of Cargo are hereby requested to send in their
Bills of Lading for Counter-signature and to take
immediate delivery of their Goods from along
side.

Cargo impeding the discharge of the Vessel
will be landed and stored at Consignees' risk
and expense.

F. E. FOSTER,
Agent.
Hongkong, 26th November, 1883. [1]

CHS. J. GAUPP & CO.
CHRONOMETER, WATCH, AND
CLOCK-MAKERS,
JEWELLERS, SILVER-SMITHS, AND
OPTICIANS.

CHARTS AND BOOKS.
NAUTICAL INSTRUMENTS.
SOLE AGENTS
for Louis Audemars' Watches; awarded the
highest Prize